

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Ranney patent (US 6,106,866). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant has responded to this rejection in detail in the response dated November 7, 2005 and incorporates those comments herein by reference. Again the Applicant wishes to point out that the current claims require an inorganic nanoparticle while Ranney describes a system that utilizes an organic carrier. Therefore the current invention cannot be anticipated by Ranney.

Claims 1-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the DeVoe patent (US 4,530,963) in combination with the Ranney patent (US 6,106,866). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.


As argued in the previous response, one skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of Ranney and DeVoe to arrive at the current invention. The compositions and technology described in Ranney and DeVoe are very different from each other. The materials of Ranney include, among others, organic carriers attached to metal chelators. In most cases the compounds already have the metal attached and are used for imaging in the human body. In contrast, DeVoe uses metal chelating compounds to remove metal from aqueous solutions such as waste water. Ranney is directed towards drug delivery systems and medical imaging enhancement. The system in which the compounds of Ranney are utilized is the human body. The metal chelators/carriers described in Ranney are not intended to remove metal ions from the system, rather they appear to be intended for MRI imaging. The metal chelators in Ranney appear in most cases to be already bound to the metal when they are injected or ingested into the body. The metal is the aspect of the compound that provides the image. Therefore the compounds of Ranney are not similar to DeVoe.

The compounds of Ranney are utilized for an entirely different purpose than those of DeVoe and would not be suitable for the use in the system of DeVoe. In fact, many of the carriers described in Ranney, such as saccharides, would actually encourage bacterial growth since they would act as a nutrient. Additionally, the carriers described in Ranney are generally water soluble and could not be immobilized to remove metals from an aqueous environment. In contrast, DeVoe requires an insoluble composition. Furthermore, the technology

of Ranney describes the use and formation of small organic molecules to act as carriers. Similar technology could not be utilized with the inorganic carriers discussed in DeVoe to form inorganic nanoparticles. Therefore, one skilled in the art could not and would not utilize the combination of Ranney and DeVoe to arrive at the current invention and the current invention cannot be obvious over the combination of Ranney and DeVoe.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,447

Sarah Meeks Roberts/fjg
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-7488
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.